

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 16, 1999 LB 194

hearing. I don't believe this idea of going only to publication, albeit with Senator Wickersham's assurance that there's an option, what we're basically doing is going into less notice versus more notice. Having the option of just mailing alone, I don't think that ever really did have a hearing. To my knowledge, the lobbyist for Douglas County, there was no vote for...on Douglas County Board that this was a need or a requirement or a legislative priority at all. This idea I don't believe got a hearing. The bill that it did get a hearing or that it was mentioned at, that certainly isn't enough notice for the opponents of this idea to come forward in a public hearing in the fashion of which we pass laws in this state, so it's almost indicative of the concept itself. A public or a mailing only would be less publication versus...or less notice versus more notice. Publication plus mailing I wouldn't certainly have a problem with. There was a letter that has been circulated regarding even perhaps the constitutionality of going through less notice versus more notice. Some people believe, I believe, that there are some parties that say that this is an antiquated procedure regarding publication. But, frankly, because of the complex financing and ownership schemes of property today, I think publication is required to be maintained. If you had a conservatorship, different trustees, the modern schemes of owning and financing property I believe demand publication at a minimum. If you want to require publication and mailing, that's...that would be fine but, again, that's not what we're talking about today. We're talking about what would, in effect, giving the authority of a county official to do away with publication and just mailing it to the last known address. Many of you who do mailings, I try to do a mailing to my district once a year, know how many households...what the turnover is in your district. And to put all of what is riding, basically a delinquent tax notice, the power of the state which could perhaps ultimately even seize the property if unanswered, only on one single system of mailing to last known address, ignorant of the modern financing schemes and ownership schemes and all the issues of conservatorships and everything else that we have to deal with today, frankly, I believe deserves a full-blown public hearing, which it did not receive, to the best of my knowledge. So I heartily support the Byars amendment and hope that we could get on with the business today. Thank you.